
From: Mantych, Timothy
To: Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Luu, Catherine (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Tsiforas, William; Tahir, Nadeem (FTA)
CC: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: 2/25/2010 7:09:13 AM
Subject: RE: DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for Honolulu Project - February 2010

Chris - If it takes more than a few months to complete the NEPA process and issue a ROD, we could expect that the project cost would increase for a number of reasons. However, it is too soon to provide a full assessment.

(1) The contract value of the West Oahu/Farrington Highway DB Contract was approximately \$90M under the approved PE budget. However, the contractor (Kiewit) will seek compensation if they cannot begin Final Design or construction as planned if a ROD is issued later than they anticipated. That could not only erode any cost savings, but increase the contract value beyond the PE budget. As it stands, the Kiewit schedule shows construction starting in August 2010.

(2) We have been provided unofficial information that prices for the Maintenance and Storage Facility DB Contract came in 10-15% below budget in February 2010. We will not receive official information until mid to late March, when a selection is announced. Prices are good for 180 days from proposal. The City has indicated that they will not issue an NTP until after ROD, but we will have to see what happens.

(3) The City will be seeking approval for FD and construction very quickly after ROD. We believe their target dates are overly optimistic. The City is preparing a bottoms-up estimate based on the design completed to date. We expect that estimate to be submitted in April. We also have a progress meeting in Honolulu next week, during which time we have scheduled a break-out session to really scrub their schedule. Right now, we do not believe it reflects reality.

Thanks,

Timothy L. Mantych, P.E. (MO, IL)
Jacobs
FTA PMOC Program Manager
501 North Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102
Phone: 314.335.4454
Mobile: 314.614.1386
tim.mantych@jacobs.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris.Nutakor@dot.gov [mailto:Chris.Nutakor@dot.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2010 6:15 AM
To: Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Catherine.Luu@dot.gov; Mantych, Timothy; Kim.Nguyen@dot.gov; Tsiforas, William; Nadeem.Tahir@dot.gov
Cc: Ted.Matley@dot.gov
Subject: RE: DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for Honolulu Project - February 2010

With all the additional NEPA, mitigation etc. are we talking of a potential cost increase to the project?

-----Original Message-----

From: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2010 11:55 PM
To: Luu, Catherine (FTA); Mantych, Timothy; Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Tsiforas, William; Tahir, Nadeem (FTA)
Cc: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: RE: DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for Honolulu Project - February

2010

Hi Cathy,

The report notes the uncertainty over the NEPA schedule and really I can't report any progress. Today, the FAA mentioned that the mitigation costs at the airport are over \$100M. We expect the FAA's report soon but they are proceeding carefully because the City has indicated that they will challenge their findings. Unfortunately, the DEIS did not analyze any noise impacts for the areas west of the airport since flights (70 to 80) will be diverted during construction over the residential area. The FAA is concerned that there could be permanent noise impacts as well. New noise impacts are likely to cause supplemental NEPA work if this alignment is maintained. Since we are not close to issuing an FEIS, I suggest that the report issue a strongly worded cautionary note about delaying the award of contracts especially since the Kiewit burden/claim is growing.

The maintenance facility is scheduled for award in March and vehicles in June with no NTPs before a ROD. Why not drag out the process some and not award until the NEPA schedule is a bit more certain?

A very small point - I noticed while I was reading that at times the report seems to meld City claims as if they were facts such as in the Kiewit section. I think it would be fine to say that the PMOC has not fully confirmed certain claims or statements by the City.

Ray

-----Original Message-----

From: Luu, Catherine (FTA)

Sent: Fri 2/19/2010 6:17 PM

To: Mantych, Timothy; Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Tsiforas, William; Tahir, Nadeem (FTA)

Subject: RE: DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for Honolulu Project - February 2010

To All:

Please let me & the PMOC know if you have any comments. The PMOC highlighted the sections in yellow and pink to note changes from the previous monthly report.

Ray and Ted,

Could you please review page 7 which talks about the NEPA stuff and Section 1.2. second bullet

Tim,

Below provides my comments:

General:

Section 1.6 - Issues and concerns:

I think you should include the following:

First bullet: Concerns- some activities stated in the scope of NTP #1 &

AR00116023

#1 A may not be allowable prior to completion of NEPA process or are inconsistent with the applicable FTA guidance on DB contract (Federal register, Volume 72, no. 12 page 2583). The City needs to clarify some of the scope/activities listed in the NTP #1 & #1A to FTA... NOTE: SINCE I DID NOT ATTEND THE CONFERENCE CALL ON FEB 16, YOU CAN ADD MORE ON THIS BULLET

Second bullet: you stated that the City has elected to begin procurement for 3 additional DB contracts.. It is possible that issuance of initial NTPs may be necessary prior to receipt of a ROD. Given the unknown date of obtaining the ROD, do you think that the city plan of issuing initial NTPs with the DB contracts will ,again, lead the City to face challenges/issues of ensuring that work under the DB contracts will be managed accordingly with NEPA requirements, applicable FR notice.?

7th bullet: concern on the MSF site (Navy Drum site)- does the City have any plan to remediate (e.g. sampling, remediation, waste disposal, cap..) the site as necessary, if during the earthwork the contaminated materials may be discovered? Any cost and schedule impacts due to potential encountering contaminated materials during earthwork?

Last bullet (8th bullet). Yes, I think you should include this bullet in the report.

Additional bullets that can be added to section 1.6 issues/concerns:

- * I don't see you mention about the FAA-airport issue. You should include a bullet on the airport issue that has not been resolved and the NEPA process is pending on the resolution of issues at the airport. (the airport issue is listed under the project status but should also be listed under issues/concerns and should be expanded more)

- * Any issues/concerns of having multiple DB contracts with aggressive schedules given the "unknown" date of obtaining the ROD at this time?

- * Any concerns/issues on property acquisition?

- * Any issues of filling new city staff positions? e.g. does the additional staff have capability of managing the project or need extensive time to be trained/?

- * Any concerns of "unknown" scope that may impact the overall project cost? (e.g. relocate airport runway if the est. cost has not been included in the contingency)?

- * Any issues/concerns regarding overall scope, cost, and schedule that need to be included or none is identified at this monthly report.

Specific comments:

Page 6 yellow highlighted text.
You listed several bullets/positions. So I assume that all the

bullets/positions has been filled already. If yes, then clearly say so. Question: per the appendix B, the PMSC agreement is for 5 years subject to the availability of funds. Then why on page 6, some of the positions has been filled by the PMSC. Should these positions be city positions?

Page 7, pink section, second bullets (I will ask Ray and Ted to review this pink section). I think that you should include the 3 proposed alternatives that the City has considered to address the airport issues and you (PMOC). And, the FAA will provide you its review on your assessment on the 3 cost alternatives..

Thanks

Cathy

From: Mantych, Timothy [mailto:Timothy.Mantych@jacobs.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 1:33 PM
To: Luu, Catherine (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA)
Cc: Tahir, Nadeem (FTA); Tsiforas, William
Subject: DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for Honolulu Project - February 2010

Cathy - Attached for your review is the DRAFT PMOC Monthly Report for the Honolulu Project for February 2010. I have highlighted in yellow any significant changes from the January 2010 report for your ease of identification. I have also included a few questions for you using the "insert comment" tool.

(Chris - I included you on the distribution at the request of Kim while she is on leave.)

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Timothy L. Mantych, P.E. (MO, IL)

Jacobs

FTA PMOC Program Manager

501 North Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102
Phone: 314.335.4454
Mobile: 314.614.1386
tim.mantych@jacobs.com <mailto:tim.mantych@jacobs.com>

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.